

Application No. 10/798,459Client Reference No. N0184US**REMARKS****I. Status**

Claims 22, 34-35, 48, and 51 have been amended for mere clarification purposes in response to minor informalities. No new matter has been added as a result. Claims 1-21 have been previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 22-51 are currently pending.

**II. Objections**

Regarding claims 22, 34, and 48 as well as the specification, the Examiner asserted that the term "computer-readable medium" used in the claims was not defined in the specification. (Office Action, page 3). To further prosecution, the specification has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to overcome the objections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the respective objections.

Claims 22, 35, 48, and 51 were objected to based on clarity. (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner suggested that "A method" should be replaced by "A computer implemented method" for clarification. To further prosecution, the claims have been amended to recite the suggested language. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the respective objections.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 34 was rejected as being indefinite. (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner suggested to replace "adapted to" with "configured to" to overcome the rejection. Claim 34 has been amended to recite "configured to" as shown above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Application No. 10/798,459Client Reference No. N0184US**IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 22-24, 28, 30-32, 34-35, 41-42, and 45-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas, et al. (U.S. 6,401,033)<sup>1</sup> in view of Stephens (U.S. 2004/0236543). Claims 25, 27, 33, 36, 38-40, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas, et al. in view of Stephens and in further view of Koller, et al. ("Virtual GIS," IEEE: 1995). Claims 26 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas, et al. in view of Stephens, Koller, et al., and in further view of Freedman ("Map Quests," Wired: 2/2004). Claims 29 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas, et al. in view of Stephens and in further view of Freedman.

Claims 22-51

Regarding claims 22-51, please find enclosed herewith a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 providing evidence of the claimed invention prior to the § 102(e) date (May 21, 2003) of the Stephens patent application publication, which was used in combination with other cited references in rejecting the claims.

Accordingly, the Stephens patent application publication is not available as prior art. (See MPEP § 715.02, part I). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of pending claims 22-51 be withdrawn.

---


<sup>1</sup> U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,033 is assigned to the assignee of the present application. To the extent permissible by law, any remarks in this response about the '033 patent should not be construed as limiting or narrowing the scope of the claims thereof.

JAN 23 2009

Application No. 10/798,459Client Reference No. N0184US**V. Summary**

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Adil M. Musabji  
Reg. No. 58,728  
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC  
425 West Randolph Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 780-3054